

## North and West Big Hole AMP Project Consistency of Alternatives with Forest Plan Standards

<b>Table 1: Forest Plan Consistency</b>		
<b>Resource</b>	<b>Standard Description</b>	<b>Reference/Explanation</b>
<b>Air Quality</b>		
1	Meet smoke management requirements according to the Idaho/Montana Airshed Group Operating Guide.	See Chapter 2, alternative descriptions. There are no proposed actions involving any burning or smoke production.
<b>American Indian Rights and Interests</b>		
1	Heritage resources determined eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places will be preserved in place, or a consensus determination of "no adverse effect" will be reached with the Montana SHPO, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and appropriate Indian tribes.	See DEIS Ch. 3 Heritage section. National Register eligible sites will be preserved in place or a consensus determination of No Adverse Effect. Cultural resources inventory shall be conducted prior to any ground disturbing activities to identify cultural resource. Under the No Action Alternative once cattle are removed from the analysis area, the sites will be preserved in place.
2	Unplanned discoveries of heritage resources during project implementation shall cause project operations in the area of the discovery to cease until analysis and evaluation of the heritage resources are completed, including consultation with the Montana SHPO and appropriate Indian tribes.	See DEIS Ch. 2, Design Features/Mitigation Measures and Ch.3 Heritage section. Should cultural resources be identified during the course of project implementation, operations will cease and the South Zone Archaeologist notified to complete resource documentation and evaluation for eligibility.
3	Heritage protection measures will be added to all appropriate contracts, sales documents, and special use permits.	See DEIS Ch. 2, Design Features/Mitigation. Under the No Action Alternative there would be no permit, therefore there would be nothing added. For all other alternatives language on appropriate heritage protection measures are included in all grazing permits.
<b>Aquatic Resources</b>		
1	Riparian Conservation Area (RCA) -1 Any activity in RCAs shall be designed to enhance, restore, or maintain the physical and biological characteristics of the RCA by implementing the following requirements. Activities in RCAs, that meet or exceed riparian management	The Design/Mitigation Features identified in Ch. 2 and the analysis in Ch.3 disclose that all alternatives will comply with this standard. The No Action will have the fastest rate of RCA recovery because it removes the form of disturbance from the RCA. The Current Management has a streambank disturbance designed to provide

<b>Table 1: Forest Plan Consistency</b>		
<b>Resource</b>	<b>Standard Description</b>	<b>Reference/Explanation</b>
	<p>objectives (RMOs), must be designed to maintain existing stream function.</p> <p>Activities in RCAs that are not meeting RMOs shall include a restoration component, commensurate with the scope of the activity affecting the fishery, which trends towards accomplishing desired stream function, as part of the project.</p> <p>Activities in RCAs shall not result in long-term degradation to aquatic conditions. Limited short-term effects from activities in the RCA may be acceptable when outweighed by the long-term benefits to the RCA and aquatic resources.</p>	<p>recovery at a very slow pace. The Proposed Action and Alternative 4 have more restrictive disturbance standards than the Current Management which will facilitate faster recovery. Alternative 4 has the added infrastructure such as fencing of stream area that are non-functioning, and an avoidance period for applicable allotments.</p>
2	Evaluate the risks of aquatic nuisance /exotic species introduction as part of project analysis (Scale – Project area).	Cattle are not thought to be vectors transporting ANS
3	Snow courses, snow pack telemetry sites, and precipitation gauges will be protected from project activity including maintenance of an adequate buffer to maintain reliability (Scale – Project Area).	There are no activities proposed that might impact snow courses, snow pack telemetry sites or precipitation gauges in the Project area.
4	Watersheds that provide water for public water supplies (i.e. where waters are classified by the State of Montana as A-Closed or A-1) shall be managed to meet State water quality standards established for protection of drinking water quality and be consistent with applicable source water protection plans.	There are no municipal watersheds in the project area, so this project is consistent with this standard.
5	New activities within known sensitive amphibian breeding sites and natal areas during breeding and juvenile rearing periods will not cause a threat to population viability or a trend toward federal listing (Scale - Breeding sites and natal areas identified at the project level).	Since grazing has been conducted and permitted in the project area for decades, it is not considered a new management activity and is consistent with this standard
6	New management activities in Restoration Key Watersheds will be consistent with recovery of desired aquatic systems.	Since grazing has been conducted and permitted in the project area for decades, it is not considered a new management activity and is consistent with this standard
7	Guidance defined in 16.2 – Section 1 (Permit Administration) of Beaverhead-Deerlodge Supplement No. 2209.13-98-1 to the Grazing Permit Administration	Grazing will occur in fish key watersheds and thus will be mandatory in those allotment that are not meeting the new standards, have WCT or Bull Trout, and it is shown that grazing is contributing to degraded

<b>Table 1: Forest Plan Consistency</b>		
<b>Resource</b>	<b>Standard Description</b>	<b>Reference/Explanation</b>
	Handbook Title 2209.13 will become mandatory rather than discretionary in Fish Key Watersheds when grazing contributes to degraded westslope cutthroat or bull trout stream conditions, and there is non-compliance with livestock grazing standards; or other aspects of livestock grazing permits terms and conditions.	WCT or Bull Trout stream conditions. Thus this standard will be met.
8	New projects will have a beneficial effect or no measurable negative effect on westslope cutthroat or bull trout in Fish Key Watersheds. Short term negative effects are acceptable if outweighed by long term benefits.	Since grazing has been conducted and permitted in the project area for decades, it is not considered a new management activity and is consistent with this standard
9	Restoration projects should correct existing problems, not mitigate effects created by proposed activities (WR 3).	This project is not considered a restoration project, so it is consistent with this standard.
10	If the only suitable location for incident bases, camps, helibases, staging areas, helispots and other centers for incident activities are within the RCA, an exemption may be granted following a review and recommendation by a resource advisor. The line officer will prescribe the location, use conditions, and rehabilitation requirements with avoidance of adverse effects to native fish and sensitive aquatic species as a primary goal.	Because there are no incident activities occurring as part of this proposed project, the project is consistent with this standard.
11	Monitor water quality and aquatic resources in fish key watersheds where chemical retardant, foam, or additives are delivered to surface waters. Monitoring should take place as soon as conditions allow for safe access.	Because there are no fire suppression activities occurring as part of this project proposal, the project is consistent with this standard
12	Require instream flows and habitat conditions for hydroelectric and other surface water development proposals to maintain or restore riparian resources, favorable channel conditions, fish passage, reproduction, and growth. Coordination will occur with the USFWS, other federal, state, and local agencies. (LH 1). During re-licensing of hydroelectric projects, provide written and timely license conditions to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) , that require fish passage and flows and habitat conditions that maintain/restore riparian resources and channel integrity. Coordinate re-	Because there are no hydroelectric or other surface water development activities proposed, the project is consistent with this standard.

<b>Table 1: Forest Plan Consistency</b>		
<b>Resource</b>	<b>Standard Description</b>	<b>Reference/Explanation</b>
	licensing projects with the appropriate state agencies.	
13	Locate new hydroelectric ancillary facilities for existing permits, outside RCAs. For existing ancillary facilities inside the RCA essential to proper management, provide recommendations to FERC to assure the facilities would not prevent attainment of the desired stream function and adverse effects on native fish and sensitive aquatic species are avoided. Where these objectives cannot be met, provide recommendations to FERC that such ancillary facilities should be relocated. Locate, operate, and maintain hydroelectric facilities that must be located in RCAs to avoid effects that would retard or prevent attainment of the desired stream function and avoid adverse effects on native fish and sensitive aquatic species (LH 2).	Because there are no hydroelectric ancillary facilities proposed, the project is consistent with this standard
14	Grazing practices that prevent attainment of desired stream function, or are likely to adversely affect threatened or endangered species, or adversely impact sensitive species, are modified to attain desired stream function or population objectives (GM 1).	The Design/Mitigation Features identified in Ch. 2 and the analysis in Ch.3 disclose that all alternatives will comply with this standard. The No Action will have the fastest rate of RCA recovery because it removes the form of disturbance from the RCA. The Current Management has a streambank disturbance designed to provide recovery at a very slow pace. The Proposed Action and Alternative 4 have more restrictive disturbance standards than the Current Management which will facilitate faster recovery. Alternative 4 has the added infrastructure such as fencing of stream area that are non-functioning, and an avoidance period for applicable allotments.
15	Locate new livestock handling and/or management facilities outside of Riparian Conservation Areas. For existing livestock handling facilities inside Riparian Conservation Areas, assure facilities do not prevent attainment of desired stream function. Relocate or close facilities where these objectives cannot be met (GM 2).	Existing fences and stock water facilities are designed to protect RCAs and limit cattle access to RCAs so these comply with this standard.
16	Limit livestock trailing, bedding, watering, salting, loading, and other handling efforts to those areas and times that would not retard or prevent attainment of desired stream function or adversely affect native fish and sensitive aquatic species (GM 3).	The Design/Mitigation Features identified in Ch. 2 and the analysis in Ch.3 disclose that all alternatives will comply with this standard. The No Action will have the fastest rate of RCA recovery because it removes the form of disturbance from the RCA. The Current Management has a streambank disturbance designed to provide

<b>Table 1: Forest Plan Consistency</b>		
<b>Resource</b>	<b>Standard Description</b>	<b>Reference/Explanation</b>
		recovery at a very slow pace. The Proposed Action and Alternative 4 have more restrictive disturbance standards than the Current Management which will facilitate faster recovery. Alternative 4 has the added infrastructure such as fencing of stream area that are non-functioning, and an avoidance period for applicable allotments.
17	If a notice of intent indicates a mineral operation would be located in an RCA, the effects of the activity on native fish and sensitive aquatic species is considered in the determination of significant surface disturbance pursuant to 36 CFR 228.4. For operations in an RCA, operators take all practicable measures to maintain, protect, and rehabilitate fish and wildlife habitat, which may be affected by the operations. Bonding requires the cost of stabilizing, rehabilitating, and reclaiming the area of operation will be covered (MM 1).	Mineral operations are not in the proposed project, so the project is consistent with this standard.
18	Where no alternative to placing facilities in RCAs exists, facilities are located and constructed in ways that avoid impacts to RCAs and streams and adverse effects on native fish and sensitive aquatic species. Where no alternative to road construction exists, roads are kept to the minimum necessary for the approved mineral activity. Roads no longer required for mineral or land management activities are closed, revegetated, or obliterated (MM 2).	Mineral operations are not in the proposed project, so the project is consistent with this standard.

<b>Table 1: Forest Plan Consistency</b>		
<b>Resource</b>	<b>Standard Description</b>	<b>Reference/Explanation</b>
19	<p>Solid and sanitary waste facilities in RCAs are prohibited. If no alternative to locating mine waste (waste rock, spent ore, tailings) facilities in RCAs exists, releases can be prevented, and stability can be ensured, then (MM 3):</p> <p>Analyze the waste material using the best conventional sampling methods and analytic techniques to determine its chemical and physical stability characteristics.</p> <p>Locate and design the waste facilities using the best conventional techniques to ensure mass stability and prevent the release of acid or toxic materials. If the best conventional technology is not sufficient to prevent such releases and ensure stability over the long term, prohibit such facilities in Riparian Conservation Areas.</p> <p>Monitor waste and waste facilities to confirm predictions of chemical and physical stability, and make adjustments to operations as needed to avoid adverse effects to native fish and sensitive aquatic species and to attain desired stream function.</p> <p>Reclaim and monitor waste facilities to assure chemical and physical stability and re-vegetation to avoid adverse effects to native fish and sensitive aquatic species, and to attain the desired stream function.</p> <p>Reclamation bonds are adequate to ensure long-term chemical and physical stability and successful re-vegetation of disturbed areas and mine waste facilities.</p>	Mineral operations are not in the proposed project, so the project is consistent with this standard.
20	Sand and gravel mining and extraction within RCAs are prohibited (MM 5).	Mineral operations are not in the proposed project, so the project is consistent with this standard.
21	Provide and maintain fish passage at new, replacement, and reconstructed road crossings of existing and potential fish- bearing streams, unless barriers are determined beneficial for native fish and/or sensitive aquatic species conservation (RF 5).	Reconstruction of road crossings are not in the proposed project, so the project is consistent with this standard.
22	Complete watershed analysis prior to constructing roads or landings in RCAs within fish or restoration key watersheds (RF 2a).	Road and landing construction are not in the proposed project, so the project is consistent with this standard

<b>Table 1: Forest Plan Consistency</b>		
<b>Resource</b>	<b>Standard Description</b>	<b>Reference/Explanation</b>
23	Where adjustments of recreation use impacts on desired stream function are not successful terminate activity or occupancy (RM 1).	Recreation use is not in the proposed project, so the project is consistent with this standard.
24	Chemical pesticides and toxicants will be applied in a manner consistent with desired stream function and avoids adverse biological effects (RA 3).	Chemical pesticides and toxicants use is not in the proposed project, so the project is consistent with this standard.
25	Project related storage of fuels and toxicants within Riparian Conservation Areas is prohibited. Refueling within Riparian Conservation Areas is prohibited except for emergency situations, in which case refueling sites must have an approved spill containment plan (RA 4).	There are no project related storage of fuels and toxicants, so the project is consistent with this standard.
26	Fuelwood cutting and salvage in RCAs will not prevent or retard attainment of desired stream function (TM 1a).	Fuelwood cutting and salvage are not in the proposed project, so the project is consistent with this standard.
27	Vegetation and/or fuel management prescriptions in RCAs will be for the purpose of restoring, enhancing, or protecting the physical and biological characteristics of the RCA including Riparian Management Objectives. Vegetation and/or fuel treatments, for the purpose of protecting urban interface, private property and other investment, and public safety in RCA's shall be designed so as not to prevent the attainment of desired stream function (TM 1).	Vegetation and fuel management are not in the proposed project, so the project is consistent with this standard.
28	Complete the evaluation of on-going activities in Fish Key Watersheds. Activities or conditions inconsistent with goals and objectives will be identified within 3 years and timeframes for implementation of mitigation will be identified.	Tenmile creek in portion of fish key watershed and covered in Deep Creek watershed analysis.
<b>Fire Management</b>		
1	Wildland fire use plans shall be developed in coordination with the appropriate county, state, tribal, and other federal agencies.	Fuel management is not in the proposed project, so the project is consistent with this standard.
2	Wildland fire use is an available tool for all unplanned ignitions.	Fuel management is not in the proposed project, so the project is consistent with this standard.

<b>Table 1: Forest Plan Consistency</b>		
<b>Resource</b>	<b>Standard Description</b>	<b>Reference/Explanation</b>
<b>Heritage Resources</b>		
1	Heritage resources determined eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places will be preserved in place, or a consensus determination of “no adverse effect” will be reached with the Montana SHPO, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and appropriate Indian tribes.	No TCP’s have been identified within the analysis area.
2	Unplanned discoveries of heritage resources during project implementation shall cause project operations in the area of the discovery to cease until analysis and evaluation of the heritage resources are completed, including consultation with the Montana SHPO and appropriate Indian tribes.	Cultural resources inventory shall be conducted prior to any ground disturbing activities to identify cultural resource. National Register eligible sites will be preserved in place or a consensus determination of No Adverse Effect. Should cultural resources be identified during the course of project implementation, operations will cease and the South Zone Archaeologist notified to complete resource documentation and evaluation for eligibility.
3	Heritage protection measures will be added to all appropriate contracts, sales documents, and special use permits.	Language on appropriate heritage protection measures are included in all grazing permits.
<b>Infrastructure</b>		
1	Facility Design: Use the Rocky Mountain and Great Plains sections of the Built Environment Image Guide, (USDA FS-710, Dec. 2001), or equivalent for development of recreation sites, administrative sites, and approval of special use structures and facility design.	The project does not propose any new buildings, thus this standard is met. Specific design criteria for scenery for fences, water tanks, and pipelines are disclosed in Ch. 2 and will allow the proposed infrastructure to meet scenery standards.
<b>Lands</b>		
1	Energy transmission facilities shall be located only in designated utility corridors shown on the Utility Corridor and Communication Site map at the end of Chapter 3. Energy gathering or distribution facilities may be located outside of designated corridors.	Energy transmission facilities are not in the proposed project, so the project is consistent with this standard.
2	Wireless telecommunication facilities shall be located in designated communication sites and utility corridors shown on the Utility Corridor and Communication Site map. Exceptions may be made for non-ground disturbing temporary facilities that are in place for less than one year.	Wireless telecommunication facilities are not in the proposed project, so the project is consistent with this standard.

<b>Table 1: Forest Plan Consistency</b>		
<b>Resource</b>	<b>Standard Description</b>	<b>Reference/Explanation</b>
3	Comply with direction in USDA Forest Service Designation of Section 368 Energy Corridors on National Forest System Land in 10 Western States Decision by Secretary of Agriculture To Amend Land Management Plans Described as the Environmentally Preferred Alternative January 14, 2009.	Energy corridors are not in the proposed project, so the project is consistent with this standard.
<b>Livestock Grazing</b>		
1	<p>The interim standards in Table 6 apply to livestock grazing operations unless or until specific long-term objectives, prescriptions, or allowable use levels have been designed through individual resource management plans or site-specific NEPA decisions; for example, revised allotment management plans or wilderness management plans. These interim standards are designed to prevent reduction of existing water quality or physical or biological functions of riparian-wetland areas from management activities. The standards are a means to assure use remains at levels that maintain existing riparian-wetland function. The maximum utilization, minimum stubble height or minimum streambank standards may be incorporated in livestock annual operating plans. In streams containing 90% or greater, genetically pure westslope cutthroat trout (or other genetic purity requirement as defined by Montana State Westslope Cutthroat Trout Conservation Strategy or Federal Recovery Plan), managers must use the interim standard for WCT in Table 6. Interim standards apply to the following situations:</p> <p>Any allotment management plan lacking riparian management objectives and guides designed specifically for that allotment. Any riparian recreation site used primarily by recreation stock.</p> <p>Any outfitter operation where stock are grazed in a riparian area that lacks a specific riparian grazing strategy in the annual operating plan.</p>	As disclosed in the Analysis section of the DEIS for Range in Ch. 3, the implementation of the actions being proposed and the mitigation/design features for all alternatives except the No Action alternative, would result in beneficial effects to rangeland vegetation, which would help maintain, or improve, existing riparian-wetland function and rangeland health, and thus this standard would be met. Because the No Action alternative involves the removal of livestock from the project area, this would result in beneficial effects to rangeland vegetation, which would help maintain, or improve, existing riparian-wetland function.
2	Domestic livestock grazing will not be allowed in	As disclosed in Ch.3 of the DEIS in the Rang and Invasive Plans and

Table 1: Forest Plan Consistency		
Resource	Standard Description	Reference/Explanation
	developed recreation sites unless specifically permitted.	Recreation sections, developed recreation sites are fenced and not considered as suitable range. With the implementation of the design/mitigation features and actions being proposed, this standard will be met. Under the No Action alternative no livestock grazing would occur within the project area, thus meeting this standard.
3	Allotment management plans will identify specific criteria for special areas, such as wet meadows, where limiting grazing at certain times of the years or under certain conditions is necessary to protect resources.	The <i>No Action</i> alternative would be consistent with this standard because the livestock would be removed, thus not impacting special area or needing to identify special areas. The <i>Current Management</i> alternative would not meet this standard because special criteria would not be identified to limit grazing use on special areas such as wet meadows. The <i>Proposed Action</i> alternative and Alternative 4 would be consistent with this standard because proposed allowable use levels, and other proposed actions under this alternative would be identified to limit grazing use of special areas where needed. <i>See Ch. 2 for design/mitigation features, actions being proposed, and Ch. 3 Range Analysis for specific details.</i>
4	Base Property Requirement - ownership of facilities and land capable of producing feed for livestock 50% of the time permitted livestock are not grazing on National Forest, will be demonstrated before issuing grazing permits.	Under the <i>No Action</i> alternative term grazing permits would be terminated; therefore, there would be no need for base property requirements. The <i>Current Management</i> , <i>Proposed Action</i> and <i>Alternative 4</i> alternatives would be consistent with this standard because range permittees would be required to meet qualification requirements outlined in FSH 2209.13 before grazing permits are reissued.
<b>Minerals, Oil, and Gas</b>		
1	Use the following table to describe the lease terms and prescribe stipulations for the Beaverhead Unit. Appendix B contains detailed language. (see Forest Plan Chapter 3, page 27).	Actions associated with minerals, oil, and gas is not in the proposed project, so the project is consistent with this standard.
2	Any new road constructed for oil and gas activity will be obliterated unless the road is needed as part of the Forest Service permanent transportation system.	Actions associated with minerals, oil, and gas, including new roads is not in the proposed project, so the project is consistent with this standard.
3	All drill pads will be obliterated.	Actions associated with minerals, oil, and gas, including drill pads is not in the proposed project, so the project is consistent with this

<b>Table 1: Forest Plan Consistency</b>		
<b>Resource</b>	<b>Standard Description</b>	<b>Reference/Explanation</b>
		standard
<b>Recreation and Travel Management</b>		
1	Permanent road construction is not allowed in summer non- motorized allocations or in areas evaluated for wilderness potential.	Actions associated with road construction are not a part of the proposed project, so the project is consistent with this standard.
2	Motorized vehicles are not allowed in summer or winter non- motorized allocations except for permitted or administrative use.	Actions associated with changes in motorized vehicle use in summer or winter non-motorized allocations are not a part of the proposed project, so the project is consistent with this standard.
3	<p>Restrict year-round, wheeled motorized travel to designated routes or areas.</p> <p>Where routes have not been designated through site specific travel planning, restrict motorized vehicles to open motorized routes identified on the Forest Plan Interim Roads and Trails Inventory GIS Layer displayed on page 53.</p> <p>Motorized wheeled travel on routes leading to identified dispersed campsites is allowed. Exceptions may be authorized for:</p> <p>Motorized wheeled cross-country travel for any military, fire, search and rescue, or law enforcement vehicle used for emergency purposes.</p> <p>Authorized motorized wheeled cross-country travel is limited to official administrative duties or emergency services such as, fire suppression, prescribed fire, noxious weed control, vegetation restoration, surveying, and law enforcement.</p> <p>Motorized wheeled cross-country travel for other government entities on official administrative business as authorized through the normal permit processes or a memorandum of understanding.</p> <p>Motorized wheeled cross-country travel for lessees and permittees limited to terms described in the federal lease or permit.</p>	Actions associated with changes in year-round, wheeled motorized travel is not a part of the proposed project, so the project is consistent with this standard.
4	Extreme sport courses such as motocross trails, technical mountain bike courses, and motor vehicle challenge routes will not be constructed.	Actions associated with extreme sport courses such as motocross trails are not a part of the proposed project, so the project is consistent with this standard.

<b>Table 1: Forest Plan Consistency</b>		
<b>Resource</b>	<b>Standard Description</b>	<b>Reference/Explanation</b>
5	New outfitter and guide permits or increases in existing permits, will be only be made based on need, administrative capability, and a suitable mix of guided and non-guided public capacity determined by a forestwide capacity study. This mix may vary by type of activity and/or season of use. Capacity validation will be made on an area-specific basis when the general forestwide capacity determination does not adequately address the management situation. Heli-skiing operations will not be permitted.	Actions associated with new outfitter and guide permits or increases in existing permits are not a part of the proposed project, so the project is consistent with this standard.
6	New recreation resorts or residence tracts will not be permitted, nor will permits be issued for unoccupied tracts or lots.	Actions associated with new recreation resort or residence tracts are not a part of the proposed project, so the project is consistent with this standard.
7	Manage summer non-motorized allocations for either a primitive or semi-primitive non-motorized setting from May 16 thru December 1, (page 54).	Actions associated with changes in summer non-motorized allocations are not a part of the proposed project, so the project is consistent with this standard.
8	Manage winter non-motorized allocations for a primitive or semi- primitive non-motorized setting from December 2 thru May 15, (page 55).	Actions associated with changes in winter non-motorized allocations are not a part of the proposed project, so the project is consistent with this standard.
9	Manage summer backcountry allocations for a semi-primitive motorized setting from May 16 thru December 1, (page 54).	Actions associated with changes in summer backcountry allocations are not a part of the proposed project, so the project is consistent with this standard.
10	Manage recommended Wilderness for primitive or semi- primitive non-motorized settings and protect Wilderness character.	Actions associated with changes in winter non-motorized allocations are not a part of the proposed project, so the project is consistent with this standard.
11	Commercial timber harvest is prohibited in recommended Wilderness.	Actions associated with commercial timber harvest are not a part of the proposed project, so the project is consistent with this standard.
12	Road construction is not permitted in recommended Wilderness.	Actions associated with road construction are not a part of the proposed project, so the project is consistent with this standard.
13	Wheeled or motorized vehicles designed for the primary purpose of transporting people, except for wheel chairs, are prohibited in recommended wilderness except for permitted or administrative uses.	Actions associated with wheeled or motorized vehicles in Wilderness areas are not a part of the proposed project, so the project is consistent with this standard.

<b>Table 1: Forest Plan Consistency</b>		
<b>Resource</b>	<b>Standard Description</b>	<b>Reference/Explanation</b>
<b>Scenic Resources</b>		
1	Where no minimum SIOs are identified by landscape or management area - prior to the completion of a forestwide scenic integrity map – the objectives for scenery shall be determined by procedures outlined in the Landscape Aesthetics Handbook, Agricultural Handbook No. 701. The analysis shall use the Scenic Concern Level List in Appendix A, Scenic Attractiveness GIS layer, and the Scenery Integrity Level Matrix below. (See Forest Plan Chapter 3, page 33).	Under the <i>No Action alternative</i> there would be no grazing activities. Existing scenic integrity would be maintained and would improve once facilities are no longer in place. In the remaining three alternatives the existing scenic integrity level is maintained and or improved depending on the specific design/mitigation feature such as using earth tone colors for the water tanks. The SIO's will also be met or exceeded in the short and/or long term. See Ch.3 Scenery analysis.
2	Projects in non-motorized and summer backcountry allocations will be designed to meet a minimum SIO of Moderate. Use the Scenic Concern Level List in Appendix A, Forestwide Scenic Attractiveness GIS layer, and Scenic Integrity Level Matrix above to determine a site specific SIO. Project-level analysis may determine a higher SIO to be appropriate.	Under the <i>No Action alternative</i> there would be no grazing activities. Existing scenic integrity would be maintained and would improve once facilities are no longer in place. In the remaining three alternatives the existing scenic integrity level is maintained and or improved depending on the specific design/mitigation feature such as using earth tone colors for the water tanks. The SIO's will also be met or exceeded in the short and/or long term. See Ch.3 Scenery analysis.
3	Projects in foreground areas of scenic byways, national scenic trails or wild and scenic rivers will be designed to meet the SIO of at least High.	Under the <i>No Action alternative</i> there would be no grazing activities. Existing scenic integrity would be maintained and would improve once facilities are no longer in place. In the remaining three alternatives the existing scenic integrity level is maintained and/or improved depending on the specific design/mitigation feature such as using earth tone colors for the water tanks. The SIO's will also be met or exceeded in the short and/or long term. See Ch.3 Scenery analysis.
<b>Soils</b>		
1	The most current Region 1 Soil Quality Standards are adopted as forest plan soil standards.	Soil detrimental disturbance is currently well under the threshold of 15% and is expected to remain relatively constant at the current level under all alternatives, thus meeting this standard. See Ch. 3, Soils section for supporting analysis.
2	Ground based yarding shall not be allowed on slopes exceeding 35% without site-specific environmental analysis that shows damage is unlikely and soil goals and objectives can be met.	Actions associated with ground based yarding are not a part of the proposed project, so the project is consistent with this standard.

<b>Table 1: Forest Plan Consistency</b>		
<b>Resource</b>	<b>Standard Description</b>	<b>Reference/Explanation</b>
<b>Special Designations</b>		
1	Research Natural Areas or Special Interest Areas will be managed in accordance with their individual management plans in addition to the regulations (36 CFR 251.23), and the policy (FSM 4063 and 2370) pertaining to these areas.	There are no Research Natural Areas or Special Interest Areas identified in the project area. Actions associated with Research Natural Areas or Special Interest Areas are not a part of the proposed project, so the project is consistent with this standard. See Ch. 2 for details.
2	Streams determined to be Eligible for protection under the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act will be protected to maintain Outstandingly Remarkable Values. Standards for protection are provided in Forest Service Manual 1909.12.8.2.	There are no streams determined to be eligible for the Wild and Scenic River Act in the project area. Actions associated with eligible streams are not a part of the proposed project, so the project is consistent with this standard. See Ch. 2 for details.
<b>Timber Management</b>		
1	On lands suitable for timber production, even aged harvest may occur only upon a finding that it is the appropriate and optimum method for the timber type and will contribute to meeting vegetative objectives for the site. Such harvest must be consistent with the protection of soil, watershed, fish, wildlife, recreation, and aesthetic resources. Harvest areas shall be blended to the extent practicable with the natural terrain.	Actions associated with lands suitable for timber production are not a part of the proposed project, so the project is consistent with this standard.
2	On lands suitable for timber production, the maximum size of openings created by one regeneration harvest operation shall not exceed 40 acres. Exceptions can be made where a natural event, such as fire, insect, disease, or windthrow created an undesirable opening. A regeneration harvest larger than 40 acres may be allowed after public notice, and review and approval by the officer one level above the responsible official. This only applies to harvest on suitable timber lands for timber production activities.	Actions associated with lands suitable for timber production are not a part of the proposed project, so the project is consistent with this standard.
3	On lands suitable for timber production, even aged management regeneration harvest shall not occur unless the stand has reached the culmination of mean annual increment. An exception occurs where the primary purpose of treatment is for wildlife enhancement, visual enhancement, riparian area improvement or public safety or protection of property. The culmination of mean annual increment of growth requirement does not apply to cutting	Actions associated with lands suitable for timber production are not a part of the proposed project, so the project is consistent with this standard.

<b>Table 1: Forest Plan Consistency</b>		
<b>Resource</b>	<b>Standard Description</b>	<b>Reference/Explanation</b>
	for experimental or research purposes; to non-regeneration harvests, such as thinning or other stand improvement measure; to management of uneven aged stands or to stands under uneven aged silvicultural system; and to salvage or sanitation harvesting of timber stands which are substantially damaged by events such as fire, insects, disease or windthrow. This only applies to harvest on suitable timber lands for timber production activities.	
4	Replace natural barriers to livestock movement removed by harvest activities with some other barrier.	Actions associated with lands suitable for timber production such as the replacement of natural barriers for livestock once timber has been removed, are not a part of the proposed project, so the project is consistent with this standard. See Appendix A1 for location of drift fences.
5	When trees are cut to achieve timber production objectives the cuttings shall be made in such a way as to assure that the technology and knowledge exists to adequately restock the lands.	Actions associated with lands suitable for timber production are not a part of the proposed project, so the project is consistent with this standard.
6	The following Timber Harvest Classification Protocol establishes where timber harvest is not allowed and where timber harvest is permitted to meet other resource objectives. (See Forest Plan Chapter 3, pages 39-42.	Actions associated with lands suitable for timber production are not a part of the proposed project, so the project is consistent with this standard.

<b>Table 1: Forest Plan Consistency</b>		
<b>Resource</b>	<b>Standard Description</b>	<b>Reference/Explanation</b>
<b>Vegetation</b>		
1	Mechanical vegetation treatments and prescribed fire in old growth stands (see Glossary) do not reduce the age and number of large trees and basal area below the 'minimum criteria' required for Eastern Montana old growth in Green et al., Table 3. Removing hazardous fuels within old growth stands is allowed if conducted in a manner that meets this requirement. This requirement does not apply to hazard tree removal and other public safety needs.	Actions associated with lands suitable for timber production, including those suitable for mechanical vegetation treatment are not a part of the proposed project, so the project is consistent with this standard.
2	Silvicultural examinations and prescriptions will be required prior to timber manipulation or silvicultural treatment. Exceptions are allowed for removal of trees that block vision along roads, removal of hazard trees, clearing of rights-of-way, clearing for mineral development, Christmas tree sales in encroachment areas, and removal of firewood.	Actions associated with lands suitable for timber production such as silvicultural examinations and prescriptions are not a part of the proposed project, so the project is consistent with this standard.
<b>Wildlife Habitat</b>		
1	From October 15 to December 1 Hunting Units that exceed the open motorized road and trail density objective will have no net increase in designated open motorized road and trail mileage (Scale - Hunting Units on National Forest lands).	All of the alternatives are consistent with Plan direction for this standard because it does not change open motorized road and trail mileage.
2	Landscapes that exceed the open motorized road and trail objective will have no net increase in designated open motorized road and trail mileage (Scale – Landscapes on National Forest System lands).	All of the alternatives are consistent with Plan direction for this standard because it does not change open motorized road and trail mileage.

<b>Table 1: Forest Plan Consistency</b>		
<b>Resource</b>	<b>Standard Description</b>	<b>Reference/Explanation</b>
3	<p>Mechanical vegetation treatments will: Retain all snags greater than 20 inches dbh (except for hazard trees).</p> <p>In addition, do not reduce the number of snags greater than 15.0 inches dbh per acre in treatment units below the levels shown in Table 12, calculated as an average for the total treatment unit acreage in a project area. This calculation allows variability among treatment units, which produces a more natural clumpy distribution. (See Forest Plan Chapter 3, page 48).</p> <p>If there are insufficient snags in treatment units, live trees in the same size class must be retained and counted towards the snag requirement. These would be in addition to any requirements of standard 4.</p> <p>These per acre requirements do not apply to the treatment units if analysis shows the levels of snags will be met for the project area as a whole.</p> <p>If, in the project area as a whole, there are insufficient live trees and/or snags greater than 15.0 inches dbh, the standard is deemed complied with by retention of the existing live trees and/or snags greater than 15.0 inches dbh in the treatment units.</p>	All of the alternatives are consistent with Plan direction for this standard because this project does not propose any mechanical vegetation treatments.
4	Do not reduce the number of live trees greater than 10.0 inches dbh per acre in regeneration harvest treatment units (to provide future snags) below the levels shown in Table 13 on the next page [of the Forest Plan]. (See Forest Plan Chapter 3, page 49).	All of the alternatives are consistent with Plan direction for this standard because this project does not propose removal of live trees.
5	Sheep allotments in the Gravelly Landscape that become vacant will be closed to sheep grazing or the vacant allotment may be used by an existing Gravelly Landscape sheep permittee, with no increase in permitted use (Scale - Gravelly Landscape).	All of the alternatives are consistent with Plan direction for this standard because this project has no sheep allotments and is not located in the Gravelly Landscape; it is in the Big Hole Landscape. See Ch. 2 for details.
6	The Grizzly Bear Amendment applies to only the Beaverhead- portion of the BDNF and is incorporated as Appendix G (USDA 2006b).	See Wildlife section of the DEIS for updated information on the projects compliance with new
7	The Northern Rockies Lynx Management Direction	All the alternatives are consistent with the NRLMD. See Appendix B 7

Table 1: Forest Plan Consistency		
Resource	Standard Description	Reference/Explanation
	(2007) is included in Appendix G, and will apply to the BDNF as described in the Northern Rockies Lynx Management Record of Decision.	for details and the wildlife section in Ch. 3 of the DEIS.
8	Within 18 kilometers of documented active or inactive sage grouse leks, do not remove sagebrush within 300 meters of riparian zones, meadows, lakebeds or farmland, unless site-specific analysis indicates such removal promotes achievement of the sagebrush habitat goal. Springs developed for livestock water in these areas must be designed to maintain free water and wet meadows.	All the alternatives are consistent with this standard as this project does not remove sagebrush.
9	Mitigate, through avoidance or minimization, management actions around known active nest sites of threatened, endangered, proposed candidate, and sensitive bird species, if those actions would disrupt reproductive success during the nesting period. During project planning consider applicable science regarding species needs (such as nesting periods and buffers) and site-specific considerations. This standard also applies to Great Gray Owl and Northern Goshawk.	As identified in Ch. 2 for the <i>Proposed Action and Alternative 4</i> , there are specific design/mitigation features (numbers 9 and 10) to minimize actions around threatened, endangered, proposed candidate, and sensitive bird species.
10	When closing entrances to abandoned mines, determine whether suitable habitat for bats exists, and where it does, provide access for bats.	This project does not propose any actions associated with closing of abandon mines, thus it is in compliance with this standard.
11	Implement the most current National Fish and Wildlife Service Terms and Conditions for wolves in the northwest Montana recovery area (west of I-15 and north of I-90) until the gray wolf is delisted. (See Appendix I)	See Ch. 3 for wolf analysis. All alternatives are consistent with the National Fish and Wildlife Service requirements for the wolf.
12	Provide habitat for species requiring large woody debris in forested habitat types by retaining post project outcomes for regeneration harvest of the following: (Scale project) Lodgepole cover type-6 pieces/ac with small end diameter equal to or greater than 8 inches and 10-ft long. Douglas-fir cover type-6 pieces/ac with small end diameter equal to or greater than 12 inches and 10-ft long.	All of the alternatives are consistent with Plan direction for this standard because this project does not propose any regeneration harvest activities.

<b>Table 2: Forest Plan Management Area Consistency</b>				
<b>Landscape</b>	<b>Management Area</b>	<b>Resource</b>	<b>Standards in addition to Forestwide Standards</b>	<b>Reference/Explanation</b>
Big Hole	Ruby	Heritage	Protect and Interpret sites around the Pioneer Town site.	See Ch. 2, allotment specific alternative descriptions, and Ch. 3 for specific analysis. As a priority site, this receives routine monitoring at least once every five years under the No Action and Current Management Alternatives. Under the Proposed Action and Alternative 4, it would be monitored once every two years to five years.
Big Hole	Anaconda Pintler Wilderness	Wilderness	Those identified in the Anaconda Pintler Wilderness to protect wilderness character as identified in the Wilderness Act and the Anaconda Pintler Wilderness Plan	Under the <i>No Action</i> alternative the removal of cattle will allow the character to improve over time and meeting the standards in the plan. The <i>Current Management and Proposed Action</i> alternatives will maintain the wilderness character. With the implementation of the design/mitigation features and limiting livestock access to the wilderness and resting Pintlar Meadows will have a positive effect on the wilderness character.